DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 077 858 SP 006 484

AUTHOR Michel, Albert; Vaughn, John W.
TITLE Evaluation of Merrimack Education Center's Project League 1972.
INSTITUTION Indiana Univ., Bloomington. Center for Administrative Studies.
PUB DATE Jul 72
NOTE 62p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Policy; *Individual Instruction; *Individualized Programs; Inservice Teacher Education; *Program Coordination; Program Descriptions; *Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

Individually Guided Education (IGE) is a system whereby change agents such as the Merrimack Education Center (MEC) work to effect innovative behavior in networks of schools. Thus, MEC undertook to form a League of Schools with the specific objectives of a) attainment by all member schools of peer support, b) creation of a communication network, and c) provision for research aid and service support. A survey assessing the operations of IGE indicates a need for more information to be afforded participants about what IGE is and a need for more collaborative decision making between teachers and administrators. (Fourteen tables of data are presented.) (JB)

ED 077858

EVALUATION OF

MERRIMAC EDUCATION CENTER'S

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PROJECT

LEAGUE

1972

BY

DR. ALBERT MICHEL

DR. JOHN W. VAUGHN

JULY, 1972

Center for Administrative Studies

Indiana University

SP 006 484

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION		PAGE
PART ONE	INTRODUCTION	1
PART TWO	PROCEDURES	4
PART THREE	PRESENTATION OF DATA	5
	Introduction	6
	Need Assessment Survey	7
	League Communication	9
	Peer Support	12
	Principals' Involvement	16
	Home-School Communication	18
	Pre-service Conferences and Workshops	19
	Availability and Use of Inservice Media	24
	The Learning Program	27
	The IIC	32
	Unit Meetings	36
	Major Strengths of Project League	42
	Most Pressing Needs of Project League	44
	IGE Implementation	45
PART FOUR	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	47
	Summary	48
	Conclusions	51
	Recommendations	56

INTRODUCTION

Individually Guided Education is an intervention system where change agents, in this case the Merrimack Education Center, attempt to bring about innovative behavior in a set of schools. Theirs is a "temporary systems" approach to curricular, instructional, and organizational change. It is a temporary systems approach in that the MEC is trying to bring about meaningful educational change without adding to the size, complexity, or supervisory personnel of the permanent system. Certain assumptions appear to be operable in the intermediate agency-temporary systems approach:

1. Change is inevitable and should occur in a goal-directed, task-oriented manner.
2. Peer approval and support, through the league concept, will encourage the risk-taking that is necessary in bringing about innovative behavior.
3. The internal and external support necessary to stimulate school staffs to innovative practices can best be provided by an agency without ego involvement in the permanent structure. The intermediate agency can marshall resources from within and without the school systems to help school staffs identify and resolve problems.
4. Building principals should maintain a position of leadership in their buildings. In order for them to do so, they need to be directly involved in an on-going process of training and renewal.
5. The leadership potential of teachers should be encouraged through the training and utilization of unit leaders.

Individually Guided Education has established goals (expressed as outcome, i.e., "The league stimulates an interchange of solutions to existing problems and is a source of ideas for new development") which can be viewed as norms of progress. These outcomes provide an operational framework within which Project League can be evaluated.

Individually Guided Education may be defined as an inservice program for elementary school personnel that leads to individualized instruction. It is long term in nature, requiring three to five years for a specific league to accomplish a majority of the outcomes.

The total IGE inservice program centers around four components:

1. The Multiunit Organization. This plan couples a team teaching approach, utilizing team leaders, with pupil assignment on a multiage grouped basis. This decision making structure allows many decisions to be made by the Instructional Improvement Committee, a group composed of the unit leaders and the principal.
2. The Learning Program. This component is the heart of IGE. Subcomponents include the diagnostic prescriptive approach, use of specific objectives, assessment, multimedia materials, emphasis placed upon pupil selection of materials and objectives, fitting the activity to the learning style of the pupil, and allowing the learner to proceed at his own rate.
3. Home-School Communication. Emphasis is given to developing a planned program of community involvement. This component includes not only explaining the program to the parents but also encouraging them to participate in it as volunteers and aides.

4. League Linkages. Individually Guided Education is implemented in several schools in a geographic region with an intermediate agency as the facilitating agent. Linking of schools in this manner provides a source of peer support, an exchange of ideas, and a temporary social system that can enhance the implementation. The intermediate agency gives legitimacy to the implementation and provides the coordinating element.

Presently, fifty agencies throughout the United States have organized leagues of IGE schools. These agencies include state departments, universities, regional service centers, and larger school systems--any educational agency that wishes to form a League of Schools in a specific geographical area. The agencies are trained and coordinated by the Institute for Development of Educational Activities, an affiliate of the Kettering Foundation.

The first leagues were organized during the fall of 1970. Merrimack Education Center began its league operation in 1971 as one of the Second Phase agencies identified and trained by IDEA.

In summary, these fifty agencies are attempting to influence schools by utilizing IGE and the league strategy. The implementing agencies and I/D/E/A recognize that the league strategy will take several years to develop. This evaluation is an attempt to answer the question, "Are the purposes being achieved at this point in time." The answer will be one of degree, providing Merrimack Education Center with objective data that may be used as a guide to future action.

PROCEDURES

The major objectives of the Merrimack Education Center's "Project League" provided the basis of the evaluation. The evaluation team attempted to gather data relative to the point of achievement of each objective.

Each objective was subcategorized into elements that could be more easily measured than the larger objectives itself. After the delineation of important elements, the evaluation assessed the most desirable way to gather information relative to each element. The selected methods included examination of Merrimack Education Center records; interview of Merrimack Education Center personnel and principals; questionnaire administration to all teachers; and, observation of a unit meeting and an Instructional Improvement Committee meeting in each school.

The data for the evaluation was gathered as follows:

Objective I: To Establish a League of Schools

1. Examination of Merrimack Education Center records
2. Interview of Merrimack Education Center personnel
3. Interview of each principal
4. Administration of questionnaire to all teachers

Objective II: To Provide Implementation Training Programs for All League Schools

1. Examination of Merrimack Education Center records
2. Interview of Merrimack Education Center personnel
3. Interview of each principal
4. Administration of questionnaire to all teachers

Objective III: To Assist Teachers in Developing an IGE Learing Program

1. Examination of Merrimack Education Center records
2. Interview of Merrimack Education Center personnel
3. Interview of each principal
4. Administration of questionnaire to all teachers
5. Evaluation Team Observation
6. Attendance of Evaluation Team at one unit meeting in each school

Objective IV: To Develop the Multiunit Approach in Each School

1. Examination of Merrimack Education Center records
2. Interview of Merrimack Education Center personnel
3. Interview of each principal
4. Administration of questionnaire to all teachers
5. Evaluation Team observation
6. Attendance of Evaluation Team at one unit meeting in each school
7. Attendance of Evaluation Team at one Instructional Improvement Committee meeting in each school

Objective V: To Provide Consultant Service to the League of Schools

1. Examination of Merrimack Education Center records
2. Interview of Merrimack Education Center personnel
3. Interview of each principal
4. Administration of questionnaire to all teachers

This summarizes the procedure used to collect data needed to evaluate the "Project League" objectives. The complete listing of the elements of each objective, as well as the criteria questions and data collection instruments may be found in the Appendix.

PRESENTATION OF DATA

The data for this report were derived from interviews, questionnaires, visitations and participant-observations. Teachers, principals and MEC personnel were interviewed; questionnaires were completed by a sample of teachers and Unit leaders; principals were interviewed formally and informally; MEC personnel were interviewed and provided certain office records; the evaluation team visited Unit meetings, IIC meetings, and to interview staff; and, the evaluation team attended two Project League principals' meetings.

The Project League objectives were distilled from ten to five, and the data were reported under the headings of the five objectives.

PROJECT LEAGUE

OBJECTIVES AND EVALUATION DATA

1. OBJECTIVE: To establish a "League of Schools" characterized by a coordinated program of interaction and training. A league should provide: peer support, a communication network, research assistance and service support. League information should be disseminated to other regional schools.

A. NEED ASSESSMENT SURVEY

In November, 1970 the Merrimac Education Center used a survey questionnaire to determine the interest the professional staff members in the MEC region had in all educational concepts. The same questionnaire described six ways in which in-service assistance to staff members could be provided and the respondents were asked to indicate the one method each felt would be most helpful and the one method the respondent felt would be least helpful. A third part of the questionnaire asked the staff member to indicate what he felt should be the extent (from "not to all" to "totally") of his involvement in determining in-service offerings.

Data from the interest questionnaire indicated that the MEC region professional staff members had a relatively high interest in individualizing instruction, pupil motivation, diagnosing pupil needs and guiding pupil learning. The survey also revealed strong interest in instructional materials and equipment, multi-media instruction, and teacher aides.

Another approach to "Needs Assessment" by MEC was a Needs Assessment Exercise conducted at a planning conference for superintendents and school board members. The participants (all were either superintendents or board members) assumed through simulation, the perspective that might be held by the following groups:

A. Teachers;

B. Adults earning less than $7,000 per year;

C. Adults earning more than $7,000 per year;

D. Superintendents and school board members (apparently, the perspectives for these two groups were assumed to be the same); and

E. Students.

MEC took its local results of the two interest surveys, compared them to literature searches on national needs, and concluded that the "League of Schools" approach would be a desirable and satisfactory means of meeting the interests and/or needs of the elementary schools in the MEC region.

B. LEAGUE COMMUNICATION

A major task of MEC, following implementation of the program in the schools, was to initiate and coordinate a set of activities designed to provide peer support, sommunication, and assistance to the various groups involved in the program.

Table 1 gives general Project League meeting information regarding meetings held from September, 1971 through May, 1972.

TABLE 1. PROJECT LEAGUE MEETING INFORMATION

TOPIC	DATE	PLACE	NUMBER/TYPE OF PARTICIPANTS
Behavioral Objectives	9/09/71	Billerica	60 Principals, Teachers, and Unit leaders
P/UL Workshop on 35 Outcomes	12/13/71	Andover	60 Principals and Unit leaders
Individualized Instruction Materials Exhibit and Guest Speaker on Management Systems	11/02/71	Westford	125 Principals, Teachers and Unit leaders. (Dinner Speaker = 45 persons
Massachusetts Association for School Principals "IGE - Elaine McGregor	10/13/71	Amherst	8 Principals
IGE Superintendents and Principals "Problems, Needs, Concerns, Resources"	12/09/71	Andover	20 Superintendents and Principals
P/UL Workshop on "Problems, Needs, Concerns"	11/27/71	Andover	Principals and Unit leaders 50
IGE Superintendents and Principals Sharing Successful Practices	1/26/72	Lowell	Superintendents and Principals
Principals' Meetings	Monthly		
Unit leader Consultants from Wisconsin & Colorado		School Buildings	All Staff Members
Monthly Hub Meetings	09/14; 10/05; 11/09; 12/07; etc., 01/11; 03/14; 04/04	MEC Office	13 (teachers and Unit leaders)

TABLE 1 (Continued)

TOPIC	DATE	PLACE	NUMBER/TYPE OF PARTICIPANTS
HUB Ad Hoc Committee Progress Reporting Systems	6 meetings	MEC Office	8 teachers and Unit leaders
IMC Specialists operating the IMC	3 meetings	Schools	10 specialists (librarians, a-v personnel, etc.)
Parent Advisory Committee Informational Needs Assessment Home-School Communications	3 meetings	MEC Office	13 parents
OTHER LEAGUE ACTIVITIES			
All League Educational Fair 16 Big Ideas selected by participating schools	5/31/72	School & Rolling Green	125
Summer course - graduate course for unit leaders (in conjunction with Fitchburg State College)			
Principals' Meeting - IPI	5/25/72	MEC Office	40

Table 1 described the types of League meetings held the time, place, and participants. Of some 28 meetings held, not including a monthly principals' meeting, the data indicates involvement by classroom teachers, other than Unit leaders, in only six or seven instances. Principals were heavily involved. Superintendents and IMC personnel were involved. Parents were involved. An examination of the data concerning topics and participants indicates a relatively low level of participation on the part of teachers compared to administrators.

C. PEER SUPPORT

IGE implementation guidelines suggest that each League organize a Hub Committee, representing teachers and administrators, to develop communication and the sharing of resources. Project League's Hub Committee consisted of representatives from each school, working with the League Facilitator. They held six meetings during the year.

The following table shows the Hub Committee agenda topics.

TABLE 2. PROJECT LEAGUE HUB COMMITTEE TOPICS

DATE	AGENDA TOPICS
9/14/71	1. Plans for All League Meetings Scheduled for October 26, 1971. 2. MESPA Meeting at Amherst 3. Newsletter 4. Information Exchange a. Identification of Successful Practices b. Resource People c. Problem Areas 5. Plans for Next Meeting
12/7/71	1. Announcements 2. Problem Sharing 3. Sharing of Successes 4. Plan for League Project 5. Other
1/11/72	1. 1972 Organization 2. Principal's/Superintendent's Meeting, 1/27/72 3. Ad Hoc Committee on Reporting Pupil Progress 4. Other
2/4/72	1. Review of Material for Reporting 2. Test Bank Ad Hoc Committee 3. Specialists Unit

TABLE 2 (Continued)

DATE	AGENDA TOPICS
3/14/72	1. Announcements 2. Test Bank Report 3. Committee Reports 4. All League Meeting 5. Other
4/4/72	1. Announcements 2. Planning All League Conference 3. Other

Six HUB Committee meetings were planned and six were held. The agenda items were cooperatively prepared and HUB representatives were encouraged to seek input from their respective IIC's. In addition to contributing to the planning of two All League meetings, the HUB Committee organized two Ad Hoc Committees. HUB Committee activities were given very positive ratings by both principals and Unit leaders as they evaluated League operations.

II. OBJECTIVE: To provide implementation training programs, using appropriate I/D/E/A materials for administrative and instructional personnel of the League schools, as well as parents, in order to:

-- build group identification

-- develop staff commitment to innovative behavior

-- help staff become familiar with IGE materials, objectives, and strategies

-- facilitate parent understanding and support for IGE.

A. PRINCIPALS' INVOLVEMENT

A major role has been assigned to League principals as will be shown in Table 3, Project League Principals' Meeting Agenda.

TABLE 3. PROJECT LEAGUE PRINCIPALS' MEETING AGENDA TOPICS

DATE	AGENDA TOPICS
9/16/71	1. Explanation and Discussion of ERIC Information System 2. Administrative Details 3. MESPA Program at Amherst 4. IGE Monitoring by Principal and by MEC 5. Review of Pre-School Workshops 6. IGE Implementation Problems a. When more than one curriculum area is being individualized b. When, within one school, Units are individualizing different instructional areas
11/11/71	1. MEC Staff: Reflections and Observations 2. Role of Principal in Individualizing Instruction: Dr. Robert Anderson 3. Social Hour, Dinner 4. League Principals' IGE Quotient to Date 5. Planning and Programming for IGE Implementation
12/13/71	(Principals and UL's Joint Meeting) 1. Plan for Continued Implementation of IGE 2. Look Ahead to September, 1972 3. Collect Building Implementation Matrices

TABLE 3 (Continued)

DATE	AGENDA TOPICS
1/26/72	(Principals and Superintendents Joint Meeting) 1. Lunch 2. Future Implementation Strategies 3. Perceptions of the Present; Alternatives for the Future
2/17/72	1. Peer Evaluation Process a. General Information b. Procedures c. Development of Evaluative Criteria d. Implementation Steps
3/23/72	1. Title III Feedback 2. Peer Evaluation Report 3. In-Service Materials
4/26/72	1. Administrative Announcements a. Budgets b. I/D/E/A Evaluation c. IGE Contract d. Wisconsin Study Skills e. NEPTE Proposal 2. Independent Audit 3. Grouping and Scheduling 4. Other
May 17, '72	Evening Meeting with Evaluation Team: Feedback Session
June 2, 1972	Social Meeting Planned for League Principals and Facilitator

Table 3 indicated that the meetings were designed to (1) assist principals in their management function, (2) provide an opportunity for principals to exchange ideas and make decisions, (3) contribute to the self-improvement processes of principals and building IGE programs. The key role of the building principals is indicated by the fact that only their group held joint meetings with all the other professional groups. IGE principals gave League principals' meetings very positive ratings as they evaluated League operations. It can be seen however that such involvement as witnessed by monthly principals' meetings far exceeded teacher involvement in League activities.

B. HOME-SCHOOL COMMUNICATION

Innovative programs depend upon many groups for survival and success. Parents and citizen-taxpayers need to understand...in order to support. Principals were asked "What has been done to develop parent and community understanding and support for IGE?" "Parent Advisory Council" was the term most principals used in describing their favored technique. That device and others are listed below:

1. Parent Advisory Council*
2. Parent Meetings at School
   - Socials
   - PTA
   - Unit Meetings
   - Back to School Nights
3. Printed Publicity
   - Bulletins
   - Newspapers

4. Parent Volunteers

5. Meetings in Parent Homes (Next Year) (via PAC)

*A majority of the principals mentioned the PAC.

No principal provided the Evaluation Team with a written plan describing what had been done or what was planned. Perhaps these "game plans" do exist and weren't mentioned, do exist but are not in writing, or don't exist.

C. PRE-SERVICE CONFERENCES AND WORKSHOPS

As an Intermediate Agency for the Kettering Foundation it was the responsibility of MEC to recruit select, provide pre-service training for, and on-going in-service experiences for League personnel.

Table 4 will describe the pre-service conferences and workshops conducted under the direction of MEC.

TABLE 4. PRE-SERVICE CONFERENCES AND WORKSHOPS

WORKSHOP	PARTICIPANTS	PURPOSE	MATERIALS
1. IGE Clue-In	Superintendents School Boards	Introduction to IGE	1. Transparencies 2. "One At A Time Together" film
2. IGE Overview	Superintendents Assistant Supers. Principals	Introduction to IGE	1. Transparencies 2. "One At A Time Together"
3. Principal U.L. Conference	Principals Unit Leaders	Plan for Implementation	1. Films 2. Filmstrips 3. Transparencies 4. Curriculum Materials
4. Individual School Building Visitations	MEC Staff visits each building	Determine Commitment	
5. Pre-School Workshop (3 days)	Building Staff	Prepare for Opening of School	
6. Wisconsin Design Workshop	Unit Leaders Teachers	Implementing Wisconsin Design	W.D.R.S.D. speciment set Filmstrips
7. Paraprofessionals Workshop	40 paraprofessionals	IGE Overview	Filmstrips
8. Special Education Workshop	25 teachers and unit leaders	Curriculum materials demonstration	Curriculum Materials

Table 4 described the pre-service conferences and workshops of Project League. Of the eight meetings held six involved teachers, Unit leaders, and/or paraprofessionals.

The table indicates that school boards, superintendents, principals and unit leaders were involved in workshop experiences before teacher commitment was considered.

STAFF VIEWS OF PRESERVICE WORKSHOPS

IGE has been defined as an in-service program that encourages teachers and administrators to move toward individualization of learning. The pre-service (or pre-school workshops) are basic ingredients of the inservice program. Teachers and Unit Leaders were asked "Do you have any suggestions for changing the IGE preservice workshops?" 28 percent answered "No." The "Yes" responses are shown in Table 5. The suggestion ranked number one for each group was mentioned most often by that group.

TABLE 5. TEACHERS AND UNIT LEADERS SUGGESTIONS FOR MODIFYING PRESERVICE WORKSHOPS

TEACHERS	UNIT LEADERS
1. Have League consultants available to discuss: a. total program b. grouping & scheduling c. use of materials d. interpersonal relations 2. Make it practical. 3. Give each Unit more opportunity to plan. Other suggestions: 1. Include special teachers 2. Limit it to one day 3. Orient aides and volunteers 4. Eliminate lectures.	1. Each Unit needs more time together. 2. Limit it to two days. 3. Consultant help in grouping and scheduling. Other suggestions: 1. More philosophy of IGE. 2. Make it more practical. 3. Provide help in realistic goal-setting.

The suggestions from teachers and Unit leaders were derived, primarily from questionnaire data. The teachers wanted a "practical" program, that would give each Unit some special time together. They felt that the League should provide consultants to assist in the resolving of "practical" IGE problems.

Building principals were asked, during the interviews in the buildings, "Should the preservice workshops be modified? How?" Their responses are shown in the following table.

TABLE 6. PRINCIPALS' RECOMMENDATIONS FOR MODIFYING PRESERVICE WORKSHOPS

1. One day for the principal. One or two days for PUL. (one principal)
2. No changes recommended (four principals)
3. Should have more. (one principal)
4. PUL, ok. Don't need full inservice (one principal)
5. The total staff needs preservice, it's a necessity. (two principals)
6. Individualize the workshops. Make them more applicable to individual teams (two principals)
7. No comments (two principals)

While the comments reflect some of the feelings principals had about the preservice workshops, there is no way of determining what they were comparing the programs to. If alternative types of preservice had been described, reactions to the possible need for modification would have more relevancy. However, the diverse reaction to the workshops does indicate a lack of common agreement on the purposes of the meetings.

D. AVAILABILITY AND USE OF IGE INSERVICE FILMS, FILMSTRIP SETS, AND HANDBOOKS

Important tools for disseminating information about IGE are the handbook, Implementation Guide, filmstrip sets, and films. These materials are to be used in a variety of ways during PUL and staff workshops. The materials are designed to transmit information, develop skills, stimulate discussions, help change attitudes, and minimize misperceptions. The materials also are to play an important role in the self-improvement process. Since it is assumed that IGE will not be implemented easily, the materials are also designed to be used in a continuous self-improvement process. Table 7 shows teachers' and Unit leaders' responses to the question, "What materials have been helpful in preparing you for IGE?"

TABLE 7. MATERIALS MOST HELPFUL IN PREPARING INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF MEMBERS FOR IGE

MATERIALS	FREQUENCY OF RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE
1. I/D/E/A Handbooks	47	33
2. Filmstrip Sets	35	24
3. Films	33	23
4. Name	11	8
5. Implementation Guide	8	6
6. Other	6	4
7. IMS Materials	3	2
TOTALS	143	100

The filmstrips and handbooks are available to the building staffs. They are, with a few exceptions, kept in the individual IMC or library. When principals were interviewed and asked, "How are they (inservice media) used?" their responses varied from "We refer to them constantly!" to "They're never used." On the whole, with the exception of one or two schools the I/D/E/A inservice materials appear to be used very sparingly. While two school principals reported that program growth was being measured by referring to the Outcomes (in the Implementation Guide), the evaluation team did not find evidence that the inservice materials were being used in a planned program of self-improvement. The school staffs appear to see very little relationship between the concepts and practices illustrated and taught and in the media package, and the problems they faced in Individually Guided Education.

III. OBJECTIVE: To assist teachers in developing the skills related to the IGE Learning Cycle (assessment, general and specific goal setting, planning diversified learning experiences, reassessment, and recycling); and to assist teachers in implementing an IGE instructional program.

THE LEARNING PROGRAM

How fast can and should a school move into IGE? Where (in what academic
academic area) should it start? If Units are meeting regularly and allocating time, space, and members of student effectively, can an IGE school be any thing but all IGE? The teachers and Unit leaders were asked, "How many academic areas of your program do you consider to be IGE? Teachers and Unit leaders were treated as one group. Data for this table came also from Evaluation Team's visits at Unit meetings and IIC meetings.

TABLE 8. ACADEMIC AREAS OF BUILDING PROGRAMS CONSIDERED TO BE IGE BY TEACHERS AND UNIT LEADERS

Number of Academic Areas	Name of Academic Areas	Percentage of Total Responses
1	Mathematics	24%
2	Mathematics and Reading	21%
0	None	13%
1	Reading	12%
2	Language Arts and Math	5%
6	Reading, Music, Math, Phys. Ed., Library, Art	4%
All	To some degree	4%
4	Not listed	4%
1	Not listed	4%
3	Math, Reading, Activities	2%
2	Not listed	2%
3	Reading, Math, Language Arts	2%
1	Language Arts	1%
2	Social Studies, Reading	1%
All	Except Science, Social Studies	1%
	Total Percentages by Major Subjects	
	Mathematics	63%
	Reading (includes Lang. Arts mention)	52%
	Social Studies	5%
	Science	4%

Table 8 indicated quite clearly that mathematics and reading were the primary targets for IGE implementation. Science was never mentioned directly; it was listed only because four percent of the respondents said they were using an IGE approach in All academic areas.

The principals were asked "How does the learning program in your school differ this year as compared to last year?"

TABLE 9. LEARNING PROGRAM DIFFERENCES IN 71-72 COMPARED TO 70-71 AS PERCEIVED BY BUILDING PRINCIPALS

SCHOOL	DIFFERENCES
A	1. We started the year with walls closed. Now a few are opening. 2. We moved from departmentalization to semi-departmentalization.
B	1. We're using Unit leaders. 2. We're attempting multiage grouping.
C	1. Very different. We're teaming, multiaging, and children are moving at their own pace.
D	1. We're teaming more effectively. 2. We're using the math program.
E	1. More small groups. 2. More multiage instructional groups. 3. More aware of assessment needs.
F	1. Math is different.
G	1. More individualization than last year.
H	1. None...we were already doing it.
I	1. We're still graded now (next year we'll ungrade) but our teams are working.
J	1. We're doing a better job of planning.
K	1. We have multiaging and Unit leaders. 2. Teachers are more involved in the total school program. 3. Our group sizes vary and we're using one to one instructional situations 4. Older children are working with younger ones. 5. Children are working at success levels. 6. Children are being assessed by more than one teacher.
L	1. We've just formalized last year's program.
M	1. Our reading program is different.

The data from the chart above are limited in quantity, but perhaps very significant. With the exception of one school, all principals felt that a definite change had taken place, although the change might have been very slight. More importantly, the data showed that IGE has progressed on a broken front and that future efforts at improvement should consider the different levels of growth of each school.

IV. OBJECTIVE: To develop the multi-unit concept in each of the league schools by --

... assisting league teachers to develop skill and confidence in school-wide decision making.

... assisting league teachers to develop the ability to use the Unit approach in organizing the instructional program.

An important objective in IGE is the development of a productive Instructional Improvement Committee, IIC. The IIC is made up of the Unit leaders and the building principal, who sits as chairman. The basic purposes of the IIC are (1) to provide teachers, represented by the Unit leaders, an opportunity to provide input into building-wide decision making and (2) to make decisions that affect the entire building.

Each building in Project League was visited by the evaluation team. Included in that visit was an observation (except for two buildings) of an IIC meeting. The following table presents data based on the evaluators' observations of the IIC meetings.

TABLE 10. EVALUATORS' OBSERVATIONS OF IIC MEETINGS

School	Agenda Topics	Frequency of meetings	Role played by principals	General Comments
A	1. Scheduling 2. Curriculum 3. Spelling	Weekly	1. Chairman 2. Reached decisions by consensus	1. Smooth, purposeful, friendly
B	1. Testing 2. Language Arts 3. Budget 4. Student teacher	Weekly	1. Chairman 2. Received input from IIC members 3. Decision-maker	1. All participants assumed responsibility for expressing opinions

TABLE 10 (Continued)

School	Agenda Topics	Frequency of meetings	Role played by principals	General Comments
C	1. Bus Schedules 2. Summer workshop 3. Pre-school Activities	Weekly	1. Chairman 2. Effective job	1. Unit leaders appeared to be representing Unit members 2. UL's ideas and suggestions were solicited
D	1. Secretary 2. In-House Guidance Team 3. Review Positive & critical areas 4. MEC Budget 5. Future UL meeting	Weekly	1. Chairman 2. Non-directive	1. It was not a decision-making meetings, due to nature of agenda topics 2. "General airings of feelings" meeting
E	1. S.S. Textbook Adoption 2. Pupil placement 3. Curriculum	Bimonthly	1. Chairman 2. Decision-maker, after input from UL's.	1. Principal exercises veto power
F	1. Philosophy of Education	Monthly	1. Chairman 2. Discussion leader	1. Based on the discussion, it appears that IGE concept is not accepted by majority of UL's. School should consider dropping IGE

TABLE 10 (Continued)

School	Agenda Topics	Frequency of meetings	Role played by principals	General Comments
G	1. MEC Budget 2. Student Records 3. Peer Evaluation	Each Tuesday and Thursday	1. Chairman 2. Good questioning skills 3. Able to rephrase questions to elicit better understandings	1. Tension free 2. Businesslike
H	1. End-of-year activities 2. Specialists schedule 3. MEC Budget	Weekly	1. Chairman 2. Discussion leader 3. Consensus decision-making	1. Full participation from part of UL's. 2. UL's appeared rushed and over whelmed by the pressures the daily activities.
I	1. Student Evaluations 2. Parent Conferences 3. Workshop 4. Units for next year 5. A-V 6. PAC	Weekly	1. Chairman 2. Directive, but inclusive	1. Relatively formal, but relaxed. 2. Strong, capable UL's.

TABLE 10 (Continued)

School	Agenda Topics	Frequency of meetings	Role played by principals	General Comments
J	1. Next Year's organization	Weekly	1. Chairman 2. Directive, but inclusive	1. Very formal. 2. Capable UL's. 3. UL's expressed the necessity of more support (aides, planning time) for Units.
K	1. "Principal's work program for next year 2. Calendar	Weekly	1. Chairman 2. Discussion leader	1. Principal has outlined a very comprehensive program relating his role to (1) system goals, (2) teacher expectations, (3) management needs, (4) public relations, and (5) self-improvement. A very challenging program.
L,M	No meetings			

Table 10 showed that considerable variation among topics considered appropriate for IIC discussion, but there was no evidence that IIC's were making teacher and Unit discussions. Principals interpreted their roles differently, although each served as chairman of his IIC. Most principals assumed a decision-making role while receiving input from UL's but several used consensus decision-making. The climate of the IIC meetings appeared to reflect the personality of the principal.

Table 11 depicts the evaluation team's observations of Unit meetings. There was one meeting attended in each school.

TABLE 11. UNIT MEETING OBSERVATIONS

School	Topics Discussed	Frequency of meetings	Type of meeting	General Comments
A	1. Field trips 2. Year's responsibilities 3. Teacher relationships -- Philos. differ	Four times per week	1. Situational, general agenda	1. Open, candid, interactions. 2. There was more evidence of team teaching than of using IGE system.
B	1. How can we get more planning time?	Three times per week	1. Situational	1. Formal, questioning 2. Somewhat hostile to IGE and its demands on teacher time.
C	1. Assigning pupils to Units	Daily	1. Situational	1. Teachers were familiar with students: evidence of interchanging pupils.
D	1. Discipline 2. IMS Pencils 3. Science Direction 4. IIC questions	Twice a week, 2 1/2 hours each	1. Situational	1. UL served effectively as chairman. 2. Well-organized, cooperative Unit.

TABLE 11 (Continued)

School	Topics Discussed	Frequency of meetings	Type of meeting	General Comments
E	1. Bus students 2. Summer workshop 3. Math curriculum	Daily	1. Situational	1. Good communication between Unit and IIC 2. Reflected the decision-making process illustrated by "Organized for Learning"
F	1. Viewed F.S. "Managing the IGE Learning Program" III	Daily (usually)	1. General	1. Unit was looking for ideas for next year.
G	1. Unit Composition	After school	1. Situational	1. The Unit appeared to have had some difficulty thinking of a topic to meet about.
H	1. General discussion	Occasionally	1. Situational	1. It was evident that the Unit was not teaming.. and had no intention of trying.
I	1. Student clubs 2. Student learning styles	1. Lunch each day 2. Recess 3. Tuesday and Thursday	1. Situational	1. Good rapport within Unit...and with principal. 2. Conventional team teaching. 3. Good Unit potential.

TABLE 11 (Continued)

School	Topics Discussed	Frequency of meetings	Type of meeting	General Comments
J	1. Policeman to visit classes 2. Materials to be shared. 3. Grouping and scheduling pupils	Once per week	1. Situational 2. Grouping and scheduling.. but not IGE approach	1. Teachers co-operate 2. Congenial 3. No evidence of any understanding of IGE = strategies.
K	1. Wisconsin design 2. Grouping and scheduling	1. Wed. a.m. 2. Tuesday after school, for all	1. Regrouping for word attack skills	1. IGE in name only 2. Teachers are graded 3. Little interest in or concern with IGE 4. It is in no perceptible way operating as an IGE Unit
L	1. Student learning styles	1. Two afternoon per week	1. Situational	1. Serious, positive teachers 2. Evidence of much Unit cooperation 3. Strong UL's
M	1. Scheduling 2. Use of student teachers 3. Materials	Each Wednesday afternoon	1. Situational	1. Teachers come close to using the Planning system approach 2. Strong, effective teachers

Table 11 showed the evaluation team's observations of 13 Unit meetings, one in each IGE school in Project League. There was no indication through examination of agenda topics or discussions that any Unit was familiar with, placed a high value upon, or utilized the IGE Planning System approach. With few exceptions compatible Units had formed and teachers had complementary skills and interests. Again, with few exceptions, the Unit leaders were doing a good job of communicating IIC decisions to the Units. Many of the Units appeared strong enough and sophisticated enough to indicate that they were ready to move toward IGE planning as opposed to conventional teaming.

V. OBJECTIVE: To provide consultant analytical services to league schools from various agencies.

Data for Table 12 came from principals, through formal interviews; from principals as the evaluation team met with them in groups; from Unit leaders questionnaires; from Unit leaders and teachers as evaluators sat in on IIC and Unit meetings; and from the results of teacher questionnaires.

TABLE 12. THE MAJOR STRENGTHS* OF PROJECT LEAGUE AS PERCEIVED BY UNIT LEADERS, PRINCIPALS, AND TEACHERS

PRINCIPALS	TEACHERS	UNIT LEADERS
1. Merrimac Education Center	1. MEC Serving As A Resource Center	1. MEC Serving as Resource Center
A. "Willing to help"	2. Have Had Very Little Contact with It	2. Opportunities for Idea Sharing
B. "Aids in Sharing ideas"		3. MEC Personnel Serving as Consultants
C. "Keeps us informed"		
D. "Helps us over hurdles"		
E. "MEC is sound"		
F. "MEC personnel serve as resources		
G. "Good to help when asked"		
H. "Consultant aid"		
I. "Financial aid		
2. HUB Meetings		
3. Principals' Meetings		
4. League Legitimizes Efforts to Individualize		

*Ranked in order of importance.

Table 12 showed that Project League had considerable visibility among Unit leaders, and dramatically less among teachers. In the case of each of the three groups Project League was synonymous with MEC. When discussing the League, IGE staff members seemed to think, "MEC." Only one principal, who said "The League legitimizes efforts to individualize instruction," referred to the League in terms that set it apart from MEC. It could not be determined if teachers who reported "Have had very little contact with it," were referring to MEC or the League.

Table 13 will identify what IGE staff members see as Project League's most pressing needs.

TABLE 13. THE MOST PRESSING NEEDS* OF PROJECT LEAGUE AS PERCEIVED BY PRINCIPALS, UNIT LEADERS AND TEACHERS

PRINCIPALS	UNIT LEADERS	TEACHERS
1. We don't see MEC enough.	1. We want MEC to visit more often.	1. More communication between the League and individual teachers
2. More interschool visits are needed.	2. More interschool visits are needed.	2. More interschool visits are needed.
3. We have to ask for help, rather than MEC volunteering.	3. More (quantity) practical workshops for teachers.	3. More communication between different teams.
4. More meetings for teachers (with specific agendas) should be held.	4. Closer contact with teachers	
5. The following comments were made only one time: a. More planning needed for principals meetings b. Not enough schools willing to share materials. c. No special needs. d. Pay aides faster.		

*In descending order of importance.

Table 13 showed the needs of Project League as viewed by IGE staff members. Data was collected from interviews, unit meeting observations, IIC meetings, and principals meetings. For the most part, principals included, staff members equate MEC and the League. They do not see the League, which is to be their operation eventually, as being controlled or directed by the HUB Committee. They all exhibit a generally positive view of MEC and its personnel and are eager to have closer communication with MEC. MEC's visibility with classroom teachers is limited as perceived by all three groups.

Teachers and Unit leaders were asked to identify the activities that took place prior to the implementation of IGE in September that were most helpful. Table 14 shows the responses to that request.

TABLE 14. ACTIVITIES IDENTIFIED BY STAFF AS MOST HELPFUL IN PREPARING THEM FOR IGE

ACTIVITY	Frequency of Response	Percentage
1. IGE Workshops	37	34.58
2. Independent Study	19	17.76
3. College Courses	18	16.82
4. None	13	
5. IMS Workshops	8	7.48
6. Other	7	6.54
7. Previous Teaching Experience	3	
8. Student Teaching	2	1.87
TOTALS	107	

Table 14 showed that teachers and Unit leaders placed a high value on the IGE sponsored workshops as a means of preparing for IGE implementation in September. It is also significant that roughly 13 percent of the respondents indicated that nothing helped them.

PART FOUR

SUMMARY

CONCLUSIONS

RECOMMENDATIONS

PART FOUR

INTRODUCTION

Since this interpretation is based upon data relevant and necessary to I.G.E. implementation, and since I.G.E. implementation is contingent upon the operationalizing of specific outcomes or goals, it is deemed appropriate to restate what I.G.E. is. Individually Guided Education is an approach to elementary schooling that provides a framework or process for individualizing instruction. It is achieved through an inservice program which is designed to reorganize and redirect the time, talents, and energy of all concerned with the educational process. To this end, the Merrimac Education Center undertook the formation of a League of Schools. Specific objectives included: (1) attainment by all member schools of peer support; (2) establishment of a communication network; and (3) provision for research assistance and service support. In addition, implementation of specific I.G.E. Facilitator Outcomes was an overriding goal.

SUMMARY

The information generated by this report of assessment appears to indicate a need for close examination by MEC facilitators of the following factors in their operation:

1. Operational problems and activities seem to be focused upon content or substantive subjects. I.G.E. is a process or framework, and not a "content" program. Emphasis of I.G.E. is upon provision of a productive way in which Units of teachers can function together to meet set objectives. Problems identified as well as discussions reported suggest that a low-level knowledge and understanding of Individually Guided Education as a process of interaction now exists. Further, that impetus upon given content areas has been and is presently frustrating by

virtue of the inability of teachers to employ the I.G.E. planning system and Unit organization in confronting and solving operational problems. In short, I.G.E. is perceived to be a "what" rather than a "how" and until this misconception can be clarified and corrected, implementation of I.G.E. will be effectively curtailed, teacher anxiety and hostility increased, and a generally negative attitude fostered on the part of many Project League schools.

There is little evidence that the I.G.E. outcomes for principals, teachers, Unit leaders and Units - stated in terms of processes to be achieved - have been used as effective tools in guiding teachers toward full implementation of the program.

2. The I.G.E. implementation strategy appears to have been structured to coincide very closely with the hierarchical organization seen in most school systems. That is to say, the dissemination plan took into careful account school board members, superintendents, building administrators and to some extent, Unit leaders. . . in that order. While there is no question that school boards and superintendents need to be informed, and that these persons have the responsibility of monitoring and assessing the effectiveness of I.G.E. programs being carried on in their districts, there is some question as to their centrality in an effective implementation effort. I.G.E. is a learner-centered process. As such, the ultimate success or failure of the program is dependent upon the attitudes, abilities and behaviors of teachers and pupils. A well-informed and positive administration, while desirable, cannot carry out the I.G.E. program if teachers are not informed and committed.

Individually Guided Education, in order to be successfully implemented in schools, depends in large measure upon the willingness of school administrators to change their perceptions of their roles in the area of decision-making. Conventional school administrators typically initiate decisions to which teachers

and learners accommodate, and the decision is then legitimated by administrators and the school board. The I.G.E. concept mandates that decision-making at the building level be collaborative. That is, teachers and learners must learn to make a wide variety of decisions germane to school operation. Rather, principals need to help teachers and pupils learn to make better decisions.

The data suggest that principals and other administrators have received information from MEC and the league. However, evidence that they have communicated effectively this information to classroom teachers is absent. Without information, decisions cannot be initiated. Thus, in a real sense, the I.G.E. process is being subverted by lack of information dissemination at the building level. If teachers and learners are to become more effective problem-solving people - one major goal of the I.G.E. effort - they must be accorded treatment as a full-fledged partner in the implementation program. The alternative is perpetuation of a hierarchical building organization by virtue of the dependency created by principals in terms of information-control, motivation, and thus interaction-influence from the top to the bottom of the pyramid.

Very briefly, the control of information by building heads requires that subordinates ask for procedural directions in the implementation process. Such asking effectively centers control with the principal, who is enabled to provide only that communication which permits activity which he decides is positive. Subordinates must continually return to find out the next "step" in the process. Thus, no over-all view of what I.G.E. is or can be is possible for the dependent subordinates.

CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of the data collected as a part of this study, the Evaluation Team has drawn the following conclusions:

1. Merrimack Education Center has based the implementation of IGE and the league strategy on diagnosed needs. Their needs assessment survey that indicated a need for individualized instruction inservice appears to have been comprehensively administered and interpreted.
2. Merrimack Education Center has adequately informed their region that they are an intermediate agency for Individually Guided Education. This was accomplished through Clue-In Conferences, school visitations, and distribution of descriptive literature.
3. MEC has organized and has conducted the preliminary inservice for the thirteen schools in their newly formed league.
4. The league has begun its initial attempts in providing peer support, a communication network, and a source of self help. While only a few of the principal, unit leader, and teacher league members can actually state specifics to document this, there is still evidence to suggest the process has begun. League meetings were numerous, the topics were appropriate, and there was an opportunity for input, feedback, and interaction. However, the teachers were not sufficiently involved. It is of dubious benefit, for example, to hold a conference on the topic: "Problems, Needs, Concerns, Resources" and involve only superintendents and principals. Superintendents and principals met to share successful practices. It might be assumed, given the role of participants, that the successful practices shared related to administration. Teachers meeting

to share successful learning activities would have been more congruent with I.G.E. objectives.

5. In the eyes of the league members, the "intermediate agency" and the "league" are synonymous terms. Because this year was the first year of league operation, teachers have had little opportunity to visit other schools, serve as consultants, and attend inservice sessions. This has influenced their perception of the league concept.

   It is logical that Project League had more visibility among principals, less among Unit leaders, and dramatically less among teachers. Clearly, teachers have very little understanding of what the League is - and of what benefit it is to them.

6. Through the establishment of a representative HUB Committee, a good start has been made toward the development of a strong central committee that will match the needs and resources of the League. While the principals and Unit leaders gave the HUB Committee a very positive appraisal, it would have been interesting to gain an accurate perception of the committee through the eyes of teachers.

7. Project League demonstrated extensive involvement of principals in League activities. Principals' meetings, agenda topics (e.g., "Role of Principal in Individualizing Instruction," "IGE Monitoring by Principal and MEC") were very appropriate.

8. MEC's plan to train paretns (by requesting a NEPTE grant) is to be applauded. The principals generally had a very positive view of the support potential of Parent Advisory

Councils and MEC's efforts to strengthen parent support is commendable.

9. The data suggested that the dissemination strategy used by MEC in implementing I.G.E. was hierarchically oriented from the top down. The Clue-In, Overview and Principal-Unit Leader Conferences were held for persons occupying administrative positions mainly, and did not involve those persons most critical to success in the program, the teachers, until late in the sequence. This probably led to feelings expressed by some teachers that they were being asked to implement a program that was not the result of any initiative of theirs.

10. The initial inservice workshops appear to have been adequately conducted. This includes the Overview Conference, the Principal-Unit Leader Workshop, and the Pre-School Workshop. Teachers in general expressed good feeling about these activities. However, too much of a burden was put upon principals and Unit leaders in preparing the remainder of the staff for implementation of IGE. It is unrealistic to believe that a short PUL could thoroughly acquaint a large group of principals and Unit leaders with the concepts of IGE; it follows then that it is also unrealistic to believe that the principals and Unit leaders could do an optimum job of preparing a full staff, for IGE.

11. A general lack of understanding of the entire Individually Guided Education concept was also evidenced by some of the I.G.E. principals' responses to the question, "Should the preservice workshops be modified? How?" Respondents who indicated that one day of training for the principal or no changes in the schedule would be desirable can only be persons with unusual training and knowledge -- or -- persons who were not acquainted with or appreciative of the depth of the changes mandated by Individually Guided Education.

12. The majority of the league schools expressed some concern about the frequency of visits from MEC personnel. They similarly expressed some concern about being able to ask for assistance and have the request answered on a fairly immediate basis. MEC has attempted to maintain a low profile implementation, that is, to de-emphasize the Intermediate Agency role.

13. "Each IGE outcome is discussed in more than one media. The IGE support materials are designed to be used over and over, in many ways and as a ready reference to achieve specific outcomes." (Implementation Guide, p. 18, R 10/71) There is a lack of congruency between the statement above and MEC schools' staffs view of the value of continuing to work with the inservice media package. More than one-half of the filmstrip/cassette sets, and many of the printed publications were not even available for viewing last summer and schools that did not pursue their study of the inservice media have not viewed the total program.

14. By and large, MEC schools attempted to initiate I.G.E. in the content areas of reading and mathematics. In many respects, such decisions are seen as unfortunate. Reading and math are perhaps of all content areas of the elementary curriculum the most standardized. Broad goals, specific objectives, learning activities and assessment techniques - to say nothing of norm - referenced tests are all readily available in most elementary schools. Thus I.G.E. Units are effectively able to circumvent - or are prevented from - actually implementing the I.G.E. Planning System. And unless and until Units genuinely experience goal setting, resource teacher selection and responsibility, role assignment, pre assessment, grouping, scheduling and all of the daily operation concerned with unit instructional design, Individually Guided Education will remain an idea or an acronym having little or no meaning in terms of teaching-learning.

    Furthermore, the data imply that reading and math were building-wide and raise the issue of what level the instructional decisions were made at and by whom. Building-wide instruction in one or two content areas is not advisable by virtue of potential competition for scarce resources and facility utilization.

15. The multiunit component appears to be the most successfully implemented aspect of the program. The teachers are organized into teams, unit leaders exist, and pupils have been assigned to the units on a multiage basis.

The Instructional Improvement Committees have been formed, meet regularly, and appear to effectively coordinate many aspects of the instructional program previously completed by the principal.

16. The Home-School Communication program that exists in many of the schools appears to be at a very minimal level of intensity. The majority of schools did not seem to have a defined, systematic program.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The "Needs Assessment" survey was, more precisely, an interest inventory. The survey did discover that the interests and concerns of professionals in the MEC region centered ground certain outcomes of Individually Guided Education. There is a significant difference between being interested in a topic and being willing to make the time-, energy-, and study-commitment that is required to effect change. Additional "Needs Assessment" surveys should take as given that the interests of professionals focus on the goals of individualization, motivation, diagnosis, etc.; and the survey should ask the respondents to select alternative means of achieving the goals.
2. In order to build upon the good start the HUB Committee made during its first year it is recommended that the following activities be initiated to provide more teacher involvement in League activities.

A. A Newsletter Advisory committee (with one representative from each building) should be formed to critique the Newsletter and serve as building Reporters.

B. HUB meetings should be organized and operated by the representatives with the League Facilitator serving, ex-officio, as an executive secretary. This would tend to shift some of the League operation responsibility to school representatives.

C. Several ad hoc committees (chaired by a HUB member but made up primarily of regular Unit members) should be formed to attempt to answer specific questions for example:

   1. How should second generation IGE personnel be hired? Can a model be developed?
   2. What should a visitor to an IGE school look for? Can handouts be developed to guide the visitor?
   3. How can inter-school staff exchanges be arranged?
   4. How can teacher-consultants be identified? How can they be utilized?

3. As a second year thrust MEC should encourage each principal to make an effort to communicate more effectively with his staff concerning the activities of the principals' group and <u>decisions</u> made by the group. This could be accomplished via an oral report or through distribution of meeting minutes. The principals'

virtue of the inability of teachers to employ the I.G.E. planning system and Unit organization in confronting and solving operational problems. In short, I.G.E. is perceived to be a "what" rather than a "how" and until this misconception can be clarified and corrected, implementation of I.G.E. will be effectively curtailed, teacher anxiety and hostility increased, and a generally negative attitude fostered on the part of many Project League schools.

There is little evidence that the I.G.E. outcomes for principals, teachers, Unit leaders and Units - stated in terms of processes to be achieved - have been used as effective tools in guiding teachers toward full implementation of the program.

2. The I.G.E. implementation strategy appears to have been structured to coincide very closely with the hierarchical organization seen in most school systems. That is to say, the dissemination plan took into careful account school board members, superintendents, building administrators and to some extent, Unit leaders. . . in that order. While there is no question that school boards and superintendents need to be informed, and that these persons have the responsibility of monitoring and assessing the effectiveness of I.G.E. programs being carried on in their districts, there is some question as to their centrality in an effective implementation effort. I.G.E. is a learner-centered process. As such, the ultimate success or failure of the program is dependent upon the attitudes, abilities and behaviors of teachers and pupils. A well-informed and positive administration, while desirable, cannot carry out the I.G.E. program if teachers are not informed and committed.

Individually Guided Education, in order to be successfully implemented in schools, depends in large measure upon the willingness of school administrators to change their perceptions of their roles in the area of decision-making. Conventional school administrators typically initiate decisions to which teachers

MEC must seek and encourage League leadership and delegate responsibility to it.

7. The first League Facilitator outcome (from Implementation Guide) states, "The league coordinates an interchange of personnel to identify and alleviate problems within the league schools." MEC facilitators should attempt to secure more staff interaction among league schools. As MEC representatives regularly monitor the schools they will be able to more easily identify staff members who could contribute effectively to the growth of personnel in other schools.
8. Principals should be given the opportunity to review the entire media package under the guidance of MEC facilitators. Principals should then be given assistance as each develops a plan, for his building, to introduce new teachers to IGE via the media, and to review certain aspects of IGE with experienced teachers.
9. While the majority of schools in the league are enthusiastic about participating, there are certain schools that do no appear to be desirous of supporting the project or of participating in it. These schools should be given serious counsel, and if the lack of interest is confirmed, they should be dropped from the league.

10. Leadership training for the principals of the league schools must be considered an on-going activity. The responsibilities of the principal in the IGE Program make continuous leadership training essential. Efforts should be made to intensify all aspects of league operation-intervisitation, interest meetings, information exchanges, use of internal and external consultants, and other league training sessions.